

University of Michigan Law School

University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports

University of Michigan Law School Alumni
Survey Project

Class of 1958 Fifteen Year Report

University of Michigan Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.law.umich.edu/alumni_survey_reports



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "Class of 1958 Fifteen Year Report" (1973).

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Michigan Law School Alumni Survey Project at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI SURVEY
Class of 1958

I. INTRODUCTION

For eight consecutive years the University of Michigan Law School has conducted a survey of its graduates in their fifteenth year after graduation. That there is an interest in such a survey on the part of graduates is indicated by the percentages of response: 81% of the Class of 1951, 78% of the Class of 1952, 77% of the Class of 1953, 77% of the Class of 1954, 80% of the Class of 1955, 80% of the Class of 1956, 73% of the Class of 1957, and 79% of the Class of 1958. The questionnaire has been kept virtually the same for each class to facilitate accumulation and comparison of data.

II. THE FRESHMAN CLASS OF 1955

Residence: Ninety-three (37%) of the 252 members of the graduating class of 1958 were Michigan residents; 24 came from New York State; 23 from Ohio; 21 from Illinois; 17 from Pennsylvania; 9 each from Indiana and Wisconsin; and 8 from Missouri. The remainder listed 21 other states and Canada.

One hundred and ninety-eight questionnaires were returned in time for the analysis. In addition one letter was received in place of the questionnaire. Judging from the responses, approximately 22% of the class had foreign-born parents and 54% had foreign-born grandparents. Twelve members who returned questionnaires were born outside the United States.

Academic Background: The class entered law school from 101 different undergraduate schools. Schools from all sections of the country were represented with heaviest representation from the Midwest and the East. As would be expected the University of Michigan supplied the largest number in the class. If the respondent group is used as the basis for judgment, less than one-fourth of the students (21% of the respondents) came from undergraduate schools of 20,000 or more. Approximately one-third (31%) of the respondents came from schools whose size ranged from 1,000 to 5,000, 16% attended schools of between 10,000 to 20,000, 17% schools of under 1,000, and the remaining 14% attended schools between 5,000 to 10,000. Ninety-eight percent (246) of the 252 graduates in the Class of 1958 entered law school with a college degree. The remaining 2% (6) entered on a combined curriculum basis. Ninety-six (48%) of the 198 respondents had received some form of undergraduate honors, such as membership in honorary fraternities and societies, scholarships, prizes, and degrees awarded with distinction.

Age: The age range of the class at entrance to law school was from 19 through 30 with the average age 23. The median was also 23. One hundred and four members of the 252 graduates had some experience with the Armed Services before entering law school. Forty-eight have spent at least six

months in the Armed Services since graduation.

Education of Parents: The following table indicates the educational level of the parents of the 198 respondents.

Table I
Educational Attainments of Father and Mother

	MOTHER							TOTAL
	O	A	B	C	D	E	F	
F A T H E R	0	1						1
A		21	1	19	4	2		47
B		3		2				5
C		5		23	1	8		37
D		3	1	9	8	5		26
E		3	1	8	8	15	1	36
F		2		10	11	22	1	46
TO- TAL	1	37	3	71	32	52	2	198

Key: O - Didn't know D - 1 year or more college, but no degree
 A - Less than high school E - 4 years of college with degree
 B - Trade School F - More than one college degree
 C - High School diploma

Forty-one parents and 18 grandparents were lawyers or had had some legal training.

Extracurricular Activities: Judging from the respondents, many members of the class had taken part in extracurricular activities prior to entering law school. The heaviest participation took place in high school where varsity athletics drew the most participants. Social or service organizations and school or community politics were a close second and third. Participation in more highly organized activities such as varsity athletics, work on a school publication, and dramatic presentations fell off markedly after high school. The emphasis in college was heavily weighted toward social and service organizations.

III. THE YEARS 1955-1958

Marital Status and Children: Fifty-eight of the respondents were married when they began studying law. Forty more married at sometime during

the law school years. Eighty-nine have married since graduation, the majority within the first five years after graduation. At the present time 177 of the respondents are married; 9 have never married; 12 indicate that their marriages have ended with divorce, separation or death. Eighteen of the 177 have married more than once. At the time of graduation the respondents had a total of 76 children; now the total number is 533, or almost 3 per respondent.

Financial Support: The principal source of income and support during the law school years for most of the respondents was from parents or other members of the immediate family. The next most important was money earned during law school years including summer earnings. The third source of support was G.I. or other veterans' benefits.

Table II indicates how many of the respondents were employed in each regular academic year while in law school

Table II
Number of Respondents Distributed by Year of Law School and
by Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week During School Terms

		LAW SCHOOL YEAR		
		First	Second	Third
HOURS PER WEEK	None	124	90	86
	Less than 10	19	15	20
	10-15	24	36	38
	16-20	13	29	23
	More than 20	15	25	27
	No answer	3	3	4
	Total	198	198	198

In response to the question, "What percentage of your work while in law school, including summer employment, would you consider 'law related?'" 115 said none; 35 said 25% or less; 12, 26% to 51%; 11, 51% to 75%; and 16 answered 75% or more.

Grades: Scores for the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) were available for all but 2 of the 252 graduates. The high score was 717; the low was 252. The arithmetical mean or average for the 250 who took the test was 541; the median was 539. This is a better score than that scored by approximately 70% of all persons then taking the test. For comparison, the average for the class entering in the fall of 1973

was 695 an LSAT score which is better than scores of approximately 97% of those currently being tested.

At the end of three years, most class members had maintained a law school grade average between 2.0 and 3.0. Forty-two had averages of 3.0 or better, and 20 had averages below 2.0. The average for the 252 was 2.54; the median was 2.45. Twenty-five percent had cumulative averages of 2.86 or above; 15% had averages below 2.1. The correlation of LSAT scores to law school grade averages is shown in the following table.

Table III
Correlation Between LSAT and Grade-Point Average

		Three-Year Cumulative Grade-Point Average							
		3.9-3.0		2.9-2.0		1.9-1.0		Total	
L S A T	700-799	4	67%	2	33%			6	100%
	600-699	15	34%	29	66%			44	100%
	500-599	18	14%	104	79%	9	7%	131	100%
	400-499	4	6%	51	80%	9	14%	64	100%
	300-399			3	75%	1	25%	4	100%
	200-299	1	100%					1	100%
Total		42	16%	189	76%	19	8%	250*	100%

* 2 had no LSAT

IV. THE YEARS 1958-1973

Residence: Of the 198 respondents, 197 are presently located in 30 states and the District of Columbia. The remaining respondent is located in England. Table IV indicates the movement of the 198 from what was considered the home state at the time of admission to their present location.

Table IV

State	Number from State in 1955	Number Presently Located in State	Net Change
Alabama	1	2	+1
Arizona	1	4	+3
Arkansas	1	1	0
California	1	18	+17
Colorado	0	3	+3
Connecticut	4	2	-2
Delaware	0	1	+1
Florida	2	5	+3
Hawaii	1	0	-1
Illinois	17	21	+4
Indiana	8	7	-1
Iowa	4	1	-3
Kansas	4	1	-3
Kentucky	0	1	+1
Louisiana	0	1	+1

Table IV cont'd

State	Number from State in 1955	Number Presently Located in State	Net Change
Maryland	1	0	-1
Massachusetts	2	2	0
Michigan	73	52	-21
Minnesota	1	1	0
Missouri	8	7	-1
Montana	0	1	+1
Nebraska	2	0	-2
New Hampshire	0	1	+1
New Jersey	3	4	+1
New Mexico	0	1	+1
New York	20	16	-4
North Dakota	2	0	-2
Ohio	16	14	-2
Oklahoma	1	1	0
Pennsylvania	13	9	-4
South Carolina	1	0	-1
South Dakota	3	1	-2
Tennessee	2	1	-1
Texas	0	1	+1
West Virginia	1	0	-1
Wisconsin	5	4	-1
District of Columbia	0	13	+13

England	0	1	

Those listed in the column "Number Presently Located in State" are listed by the state in which they have their office. Occasionally the office and residence are in different states.

One hundred and four respondents are now located in what was considered their home state during attendance in law school; 70 in what was considered their hometown prior to law school; and 68 are located in either the city or state in which they took their undergraduate training.

Size of Communities: Table V organizes the respondents in terms of the size of the community in which they work; it also compares figures for all lawyers throughout the country.

Table V

Size of Community	Class of '58		All Lawyers in U.S.*		
	Number	Percent	Number		Percent
Under 25M	19	9% 26%	132,868		37%
25M to 100M	33	17%			
100M to 200M	27	14%	100M to 250M	39,162	11%
200M to 500M	17	8%	250M to 500M	41,075	12%
500M to 1M	39	20% 52%	142,137		40%
Over 1M	63	32%			
Total	198	100%	355,242		100%

* The 1971 Lawyer Statistical Report, American Bar Foundation, 1972

Table VI shows the correlation between the sizes of "hometowns" and present location of class members.

Table VI

Size of City of Present Location	Size of City of Origin						Total
	Under 25M	25M to 100M	100M to 200M	200M to 500M	500M to 1M	Over 1M	
Under 25M	14	3				2	19
25M to 100M	7	14	3	1	1	7	33
100M to 200M	10	3	9	1		4	27
200M to 500M	4	5	2	3	1	2	17
500M to 1M	18	6		2	6	7	39
Over 1M	11	10	4	2	4	32	63
Total	64	41	18	9	12	54	198

Table VII shows the correlation between size of community and the various occupations of the members of the Class of '58.

Table VII
Correlation Between Size of City of Present Location
& Occupation

Size of City Where Working	Occupation						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	TOTAL
Under 25M	15	2		1		1	19
25M to 100M	20	8	2			2	32
100M to 200M	18	6	1	1		1	27
200M to 500M	12	4				1	17
500M to 1M	22	9	1	1		6	39
Over 1M	36	19		1		6	62
Total	123	48	4	4		17	196*

*2 no answer to occupation

Key: A - Lawyers in private practice or in a law firm
 B - Lawyers, salaried other than law firms (excluding judges, teachers and legislators)
 C - Educators
 D - Judges
 E - Legislators
 F - Non-lawyers

Further information about members in these categories was obtained through the questionnaire. Of the 48 lawyers in Category B (salaried, other than judges, teachers or legislators) 14 are employed by federal, state or local government; 32 are employed by organizations for profit; and 2 checked "other." Two in Category C (educator) are with law schools as professors of law. The remaining 2 in this category are teaching "other" on the college level. One of the 4 judges is in a federal court. The other three are in state or local courts. Two judges are in trial court, one in intermediate appellate, and one checked "other." Of the 17 in Category F (non-lawyer) 3 are sole or co-proprietors; 6 are employees in supervisory positions; 3 are employed by government (other than judge, legislator, or educator); and 5 checked "other."

The questionnaire also requested information on the kinds of work performed by those in Categories B and F (see above). Of salaried employees (either lawyer or non-lawyer, working in an organization other than a law firm and excluding judges, teachers and legislators) 38 are legal staff in corporate or governmental organizations. The remainder have diverse occupations which include general

manager, international trade, investment analysis, underwriting (financial), trust and estate specialist, and president or vice president of a business. Thirty-eight of the respondents are with organizations which have over 1,000 employees. Thirty-nine respondents supervise from 1 to 10 employees; 7 supervise from 11 to 50; and 9 supervise over 51.

Combining Categories A and B (i.e. all those working as lawyers whether employed or in private practice, a total of 171) the questionnaire asked for the number of other lawyers in the respondent's office or department. Table VIII gives the results.

Table VIII
Respondents Distributed According to Number of
Other Lawyers in Office or Department

Other Lawyers	0	1-3	4-7	8-15	16-30	31-50	Over 51	No ans.
Respondents	11	39	27	23	14	11	26	20

According to The 1971 Lawyer Statistical Report, American Bar Foundation, 1972; a 1968 publication entitled WHERE published by Lawyer Placement Information Services, ABA; as well as a 1966 report by the ABA Committee on Economics of Law Practice, the number of individual practitioners has been steadily decreasing since 1948, while the number of partnerships and associates has been increasing. The Class of '58 seems to reflect this trend. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents in private practice are in partnerships or professional corporations. The 1971 Statistical Report also notes an increase in the percentage of lawyers employed by private industry, educational institutions, and other private employment. Thirty-four percent (69) of the 1958 respondents are thus employed.

Table IX
Lawyers in Private Practice

Class of 1958				
	Number	% of Those In Private Practice	% of All 1958 Re- spondents	% of All Lawyers In Practice (1971)*
Sole practitioner	16	13%	8%	36.6%
Sole practitioner in non-partnership	6	5%	3%	
Member of a part- nership	96	78%	49%	28.5%
Employee of a partnership	5	4%	3%	(Associate) 7.6%
Respondents not in Private Practice	(75)**		(37%)	

* The 1971 Lawyer Statistical Report, American Bar Foundation, 1972

** Includes 2 who did not indicate occupation

A demographic survey of its readers conducted by the ABA Journal and reported in the December 1970, Volume 56 issue, indicated that 19.8% of those replying were sole practitioners and 52.9% of those replying were partners or associates in a firm. This percentage was based on 552 replies. The respondents of the Class of '58 seem to follow this trend.

Thirty-four of the 123 practitioners, Category A (see Table VII), have been in private practice for approximately 15 years. Seventy-one more have been in private practice for 10 through 14 years. Sixty-seven of those in partnership started in established firms; 23 started with another lawyer then in solo practice and formed a firm; and 11 started by themselves and have added others. Sixty-seven of the 96 respondents who are members of a law partnership or corporation report that their firm has a written agreement.

The ABA ECONOMIC FACTS ABOUT PRACTICE, 1966 mentioned earlier states that the average lawyer is compensated for only 5 1/2 hours of an eight-hour day. It also states that about one-third of a lawyer's professional time is devoted to unpaid legal work, education, office management and public service. The questionnaire asked that the respondents indicate the approximate division of their time (average hours per week) during the most recent 12 months among the following categories: chargeable time for clients, non-chargeable time for clients, and career-oriented work. While not all of the 123 practicing lawyers answered this, the responses would indicate they manage more chargeable hours than the 5 1/2 per day given in the ABA report. Table X indicates the way the class's practicing lawyers divided their time during the most recent 12 months.

Table X
Division of Time for Practicing Lawyers in the
Class of '58

	Average Hours Per Week						No ans.
	Under 10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	Over 50	
Chargeable time	0		21 (17%)	63 (51%)	20 (16%)	15 (12%)	5 (4%)
Non-chargeable time	78 (63%)	28 (23%)	1 (1%)		0		16 (13%)
Career-oriented work	84 (68%)	23 (19%)	3 (2%)		0		13 (11%)

The hours spent by each respondent in all three categories were totaled with the following results. Forty-five (36%) of the practicing lawyers spend 40 to 50 hours per week in professional effort of one kind or another; 28 (23%) spend about 55 hours; 30 (24%) spend over 60 hours. Sixteen (13%) spend up through 35 hours per week. The remaining 4% did not answer this question.

Specialties: Those members of the class working as lawyers whether in practice, for government, or for a corporation, were asked to indicate their specialty, or specialties, if they had any. "Specialty" was defined as an area of law in which one spends more than 25% of his working time. Members were asked to limit themselves to three responses. Classifying occupations by subject matter has only limited value in revealing a lawyer's true function. But lawyers are accustomed to identifying themselves in these terms and thus should have a fair notion of the meaning of a classification of the sort listed below. Table XI lists specialties in order of frequency of response.

Table XI

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>Number of Specialists</u>
Corporation & Business Counseling	44
Real Property	29
Trial, General	25
Trust & Probate	23
Taxation	23
Trial, Negligence	19
No area accounts for 25% of time	15
Banking & Commercial Law	12
Other	12
Criminal Law	12
Antitrust	11
Domestic Relations	11
Negligence	10
Administrative Law	9
Insurance	9
Labor Law	8
Securities Issuance & Regulation	7
Municipal	6
Patent, Trademark & Copyright	5
Bankruptcy - Collections	3
International Law	3
Public Utility Regulation	3
Workmen's Compensation	3
Admiralty	2
Legislation	2
Employee Benefits	2
Oil, Gas & Mineral	1
Government Contracts	1
Aviation	0

The respondents were also asked to check membership certificates, some of which suggest specialized practice of interests.

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Local Bar Association	156
State Bar Association	166
Federal Bar Association	18
American Bar Association	122
Patent Bar	4
American Trial Lawyers' Association	18
American College of Trial Lawyers	0
International Assoc. of Insurance Counsel	2
CPA	4
CLU	1
Real Estate License	6
Other	22

One hundred and thirty-nine respondents are admitted to practice before one state court, 40 in two states, and 12 in three or more.

Career Objective: Ninety-nine of the 198 respondents entered law school with a particular career objective in mind, and 88 of these had the same career objective in mind at graduation time. Forty others left law school with a career objective. Presumably 11 of these 40 changed their career objective sometime after their freshman year, and the remaining 29 acquired an objective while attending law school. One hundred and nine of those who had a career objective at graduation are presently achieving it, and most feel it was a sound choice; of these 109, 92 are among the high earners (\$25,000 or more average yearly income, excluding taxes and investment). Eighty-one of the 109 are practicing lawyers or members of a law firm.

Stability: Judging from the respondents, the Class of '58 gives evidence of occupational stability. One hundred and twenty-four of the 198 have held positions with no more than two firms or organizations, while 40 more have been connected with only 3. Eighty-eight (44%) have been with their present firm or organization for more than 10 years; 9 for 10 years, 6 for 9; 9 for 8; 5 for 7; 7 for 6; 14 for 5; 12 for 4; 9 for 3; 14 for 2; and 11 for 1. Forty-eight have had their careers interrupted by military service; 4 by travel and study abroad; and 11 have done post-graduate work in law, business, accounting or other fields, full time, for periods of six months or more.

Ninety-eight of the 123 practitioners have been in practice for 12 years or more. Forty-four of these have had their own office or have been with the same firm for the same length of time. Only 6 of the remaining 54 have been with more than 3 firms since leaving law school. Twenty-two of the 123 practitioners are in practice by themselves, either as sole practitioners or sole practitioners in non-partnership association with other lawyers. Ninety-six are members of a partnership or professional corporation. Five are employees

of a partnership or professional corporation.

Both lawyers and non-lawyers were asked to indicate in chronological order the kinds of positions they have held since graduation. There was an opportunity to indicate 6. Not counting military service (except for career officers) the first position held by 97 of the respondents was as an employee of a law firm. Twenty-three were employed as lawyers for corporations. Seventeen accepted positions with state or federal government (excluding judicial clerkships). Nineteen others took positions suggested by the following descriptions: trust officer in a bank; government employee, non-law; military JAG; CPA, employee of a CPA firm; engineering; non-judicial clerkship; insurance adjuster; court employee; teaching; family business; Legal Aid Bureau; public accounting partnership; and as a student abroad. Ten began as corporate employees (non-law). Eleven started their careers practicing by themselves. Seven accepted judicial clerkships. One continued a military career in the Coast Guard. Six took positions with city or county government, and 6 became partners in a law firm.

Twenty-three respondents have held one kind of position since graduation; 82 have held 2 kinds; 57, 3; 13, 4; 13, 5; and 9 have held 6 kinds of positions.

Income: Members were asked to indicate their average income (before taxes, excluding income from investments) during four separate periods since graduation; the first three years; the second three years; the next four years; and the most recent four years. Table XII reveals the growth of income over the 15 years since graduation. During the first three years out of law school 66% of 193* members earned less than \$7,500 and less than 1% earned over \$12,500. During the last four years 99% of the 191** answering this section earned \$12,500 or over.

* 5 did not give a figure for the first four years

** 7 did not give a figure for the most recent four years

Table XII
Average Annual Income
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments) Since Graduation

Years Since Graduation From Law School

	First 3		Next 3 (4 thru 6)		Next 4 (7 thru 10)		Most Recent 4	
Range	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Below \$3,000	2	1%	Below \$7500	8	4%	Below \$10,000	5	2.5%
\$3,000-4,999	31	16%						
\$5,000-7,499	95	48%						
\$7,500-9,999	51	26%	48	24%	Below \$15,000	3	1.5%	
\$10,000-12,499	14	7%	67	34%				
\$12,500-14,999			47	24%				
\$15,000-17,499			23	12%	36	18%	4	2%
\$17,500-19,999					34	17%	7	3.5%
\$20,000-22,499					28	14%	14	7%
\$22,500-24,999					60	30%	7	3.5%
\$25,000-29,999							37	19%
\$30,000-34,999							26	13%
\$35,000-40,000							24	12%
Over \$40,000							69	35%
No answer	5	2%	5	2%	6	3%	7	3.5%
Total	198	100%	198	100%	198	99.5%	198	100%

Tables XIII, XIV, and XV permit comparison of average incomes by occupation during the most recent four years.

Table XIII
Private Practice Lawyers
Income - Most Recent Four Years
(Before Taxes & Excluding Investments)

	Sole Practitioner	Member of Partnership	Sole Practitioner in Non-partnership Assn.	Employees of Partnership
Below \$15,000	4	2	2	2
\$15,000-17,499				
\$17,500-19,999				
\$20,000-22,499		4		
\$22,500-24,999	5	4	4	3
\$25,000-29,999		7		
\$30,000-34,999		12		
\$35,000-40,000		10		
Over \$40,000	6	53	0	0
No answer		4		
Total	16	96	6	5

In the demographic study entitled "In Search of the Average Lawyer," which was referred to on page 9 of this report, the average annual income reported by respondents was \$27,960; the median was \$21,260. It must be remembered that this study was published in 1970, but even so it appears Michigan graduates are not typical when it comes to income.

Table XIV
Salaried Lawyers Other Than Law Firms
Income - Most Recent Four Years
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments)

Income Range	Government	Organization for Profit	Other
Below \$15,000	4	4	1
\$15,000-17,499			
\$17,500-19,999			
\$20,000-22,499		4	1
\$22,500-24,999			
\$25,000-40,000			
No answer	0	1	0
Total	14	32	2

Table XV
Non-lawyer*
Income - Most Recent Four Years
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments)

Income Range	Non-lawyer Respondents
Below \$15,000	3
\$15,000-17,499	
\$17,500-19,999	
\$20,000-22,499	0
\$22,500-24,999	
\$25,000-34,999	9
Over \$35,000	13
No answer	0
Total	25

*Including judges, educators and legislators

Table XVI compares the average income of practicing lawyers for the most recent four years with those in all other categories listed in the questionnaire.

Table XVI
Practitioner Compared With All Other Categories
Income - Most Recent Four Years
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments)

Income Range	Practitioners		All Others	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below \$15,000	4	3%	3	4%
\$15,000-17,499			3	4%
\$17,500-19,999			4	5%
\$20,000-22,499	8	7%	6	8%
\$22,500-24,999	6	5%	1	1%
\$25,000-29,999	10	8%	27	37%
\$30,000-34,999	16	14%	10	14%
\$35,000-40,000	15	13%	9	13%
Over \$40,000	59	50%	10	14%
No answer	5		2	
Total	123	100%*	75#	100%**

*Based on 118

**Based on 73

2 persons who did not check occupation but did indicate income are included in this figure.

V. HIGH EARNERS

One hundred and fifty-six of the 198 respondents indicated that their average income for the most recent four years was \$25,000 or more. These have been designated "high earners." The amount of money one earns is not the only or possibly even the best measure of success, but certainly it is one of the most common. What follows is an analysis of the high earners group which parallels that of the entire class. An analysis of the characteristics of this group should indicate whether factors which employers regard as important actually bear any relationship to financial success.

Age, Marital Status and Children: The average age of the high earners when they entered law school was 23 - the same as that for the entire 252 graduates. Fifty were married at the time they entered law school. Thirty-six married at sometime during their three years in law school. By graduation these 86 had had 62 of the total of 76 children for the class. Currently 145 of the high earners are married and account for 441 children of the 533 total for the 198 respondents. Fourteen of the high earners have been married more than once.

Table XVII compares the marital status of the high earners with that of the remaining 42.

Table XVII

High Earners (156)		Remaining (42)	
32% (50)	Married at time of entrance	19% (8)	
23% (36)	Married while in law school	10% (4)	
93% (145)	Now married	76% (32)	
2% (3)	Never married	14% (6)	
5% (8)	Divorced, separated or spouse deceased	10% (4)	
9% (14)	More than one marriage	10% (4)	

Financial Support: The principal sources of support listed by the high earners are very similar to those for the entire 198. The order of importance was exactly the same - parental or family, first; earnings during law school years including summer earnings, second; and G.I. Bill or other veterans' benefits, third; with savings from pre-law school earnings fourth. Table XVIII compares the average number of hours worked per week by the high earners with the average for the remaining respondents in each of the three years in law school.

Table XVIII
Average Hours Employed While in Law School

Hours Per Week	First Year		Second Year		Third Year	
	High Earners	All Others	High Earners	All Others	High Earners	All Others
None	59%	76%	42%	57%	40%	55%
Less than 10	11%	5%	7%	10%	11%	7%
10-15	15%	2%	21%	7%	21%	14%
16-20	7%	5%	17%	7%	13%	7%
More than 20	7%	10%	12%	14%	14%	12%
No answer	1%	2%	0.6%	5%	1%	5%
Total	100%	100%	99.6%	100%	100%	100%

Two of the 156 high earners did not take the LSAT. The arthmetical mean (average) for the 154 who did take the test was 546. The median was 543. The mean for the remaining 42 respondents was 541, and the median was 542. The grade point averages of the two groups was 2.62 for the high earners and 2.47 for the remaining 42. The medians were 2.58 and 2.44 respectively. Twenty-one percent of the high earners had grade point averages in the 3.0 and up range against 14% of the remaining 42. Seven percent of the high earners had averages in the 1.0 to 2.0 range compared with 17% of the other 42. Forty-nine percent (77) of the high earners had received scholastic honors of some sort while enrolled in undergraduate school, while 43% (19) of the remaining respondents had received such honors.

Size of Community: Table XIX shows the distribution among cities of various sizes in which the 156 were raised and the cities in which they now work compared with the remaining respondents.

Table XIX
Comparison of Population of City Where Respondents Were
Raised and That in Which They Currently Work

Size of City	156 High Earners				42 Other			
	Raised In No.	%	Work In No.	%	Raised In No.	%	Work In No.	%
Under 25,000	50	32%	14	9%	14	33%	5	12%
25,000 to 100,000	31	20%	27	17%	10	24%	6	14%
100,000 to 200,000	10	6%	19	12%	8	19%	8	19%
200,000 to 500,000	7	4%	14	9%	2	5%	3	7%
500,000 to 1,000,000	11	8%	31	20%	1	2%	8	19%
Over 1,000,000	47	30%	51	33%	7	17%	12	29%
Total	156	100%	156	100%	42	100%	42	100%

Among both the high earners and the remaining 42 the tendency seemsto be to work in large metropolitan areas. Sixty-two percent of the high earners work in cities of 200,000 or more and 55% of the remaining 42 work in cities of comparable size. Only 42% of the high earners were raised in cities of this size, and only 24% of the remaining 42 were brought up in such communities.

Occupations: One hundred high earners are in private practice or law firms; 34 are salaried employees working as lawyers; 3 are in education; 3 are judges; and 6 of the 16 high earners who are in non-law occupations are employed in supervisory positions (non-

government); 3 are sole or co-proprietors; 3 are employed by government (excluding judges, educators, and legislators); and the remaining 4 checked "other." One hundred and six high earners have been with no more than two firms or organizations since graduation. This is 68% of the high earners. Eighteen (43%) of the remaining respondents have been with no more than 2 firms or organizations. Twenty-eight (18%) additional high earners have been with no more than 3 compared with 12 (29%) of the remaining 42. Eighty (51%) of the high earners have been with their present firm or organization for more than 10 years as compared with 8 (19%) of the other 42 respondents. Eighty-two of the 100 high earners in private practice are members of a partnership or professional corporation, 11 are sole practitioners, 4 are sole practitioners in non-partnership association with other lawyers, and 3 are employees of a partnership or professional corporation. Eighty-six of the 100 have been in private practice for 12 years or longer.

Specialties: Of the 29 categories listed in the questionnaire only one was not checked by at least one high earner. This was aviation. Table XX tabulates the numbers and percentages of high earners in 13 categories and compares them with similar figures for the remaining practitioners. Each of the 13 categories was checked by at least 10 respondents working as lawyers (see Table XI). The respondents were invited to check as many as three specialties.

Table XX

<u>Specialties</u>	High Earners		Remaining Practitioners	
	No.	%*	No.	%**
Corporation & Business Counseling	36	27%	8	22%
Real Property	22	16%	7	19%
Trial, General	21	15%	4	11%
Trust & Probate	19	14%	4	11%
Taxation	18	13%	5	14%
Trial, Negligence	16	12%	3	8%
No area accounts for more than 25% of time	12	9%	3	8%
Banking & Commercial Law	11	8%	1	3%
Other	8	6%	4	11%
Antitrust	8	6%	3	8%
Criminal Law	8	6%	4	11%
Negligence, Investigation & Negotiation	7	5%	3	8%
Domestic Relations	7	5%	4	11%

*Percents based on 134 (number of high earners who are working as lawyers in private practice, a law firm, or as salaried lawyers in other than a law firm, excluding judges, teachers and legislators).

**Percents based on 37 arrived at in same manner as that of high earners.

Eighty (80%) of the 100 high earners who are lawyers in private practice or with a law firm log anywhere from 35 to over 60 hours per week of chargeable time. Eighteen (78%) of the 23 others in this category register so much income-producing time. Eighty-seven percent of the high earners in this category spend from 5 to 20 hours in non-chargeable time for clients. Eighty-three percent of the remaining 23 lawyers in private practice indicated a similar amount of hours in non-chargeable time, with one indicating more than 20 hours per week. Eighty-six percent of the 100 high earners spend 5 to 20 hours per week in career-oriented work other than for clients, and 3 spend more than 20 hours. Twenty-one of the remaining practitioners (91%) spend an equal amount of time in career development.

When the entire 156 high earners are considered, it is found that 77, or 49%, have participated in formalized courses in law or other fields since graduation. Forty-seven have held appointive or elective office; 81 have been active in civic affairs. Table XXI compares these activities of the high earners with those of the rest of the respondents.

Table XXI

	High Earners	Others
Post-law Education	49% (77)	57% (24)
Appointive or Elective Offices	30% (47)	36% (15)
Civic Activities	52% (81)	67% (28)

VI. THE LAW SCHOOL PROGRAM

The class was asked to indicate whether course offerings in the following subjects should be increased or decreased. The suggested increases outweigh the suggested decreases.

Table XXII
Suggested Increases

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>First Choice</u>	<u>Second Choice</u>	<u>Third Choice</u>
Commercial Law (including Corp.)	26	14	12
Contracts & Remedies	2	5	4
Criminal Law	3	6	3
Domestic Relations	2	0	3
Estate Planning	14	20	19
Jurisprudence (including legal history)	4	1	6

Table XXII cont'd

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>First Choice</u>	<u>Second Choice</u>	<u>Third Choice</u>
Labor Law	2	5	3
Legal Writing	32	10	12
Non-law courses in gov., finance, phil- osophy, or other courses of possible relevance to lawyers	7	16	11
Professional Responsibility	10	11	6
Public or Private International Law	0	4	1
Procedure, Evidence & Trial Practice	39	24	11
Real Property (including oil & gas)	6	2	4
Taxation	12	8	7
Torts & Personal Injury	0	6	3
Administrative Law	6	7	16
Municipal Law	1	7	4
Constitutional Law (including Civil Rights)	1	5	6
Other	6	8	3

Suggested Decreases

Commercial Law (including Corp.)	0	2	3
Contracts & Remedies	7	0	1
Criminal Law	6	5	3
Domestic Relations	16	5	5
Estate Planning	2	4	2
Jurisprudence (including legal history)	17	15	9
Labor Law	0	2	5
Legal Writing	6	5	5
Non-law courses in gov., finance, phil- osophy, or other courses of possible relevance to lawyers	16	13	8
Professional Responsibility	2	6	3
Public Or Private International Law	18	9	8
Procedure, Evidence & Trial Practice	3	2	0
Real Property (including oil & gas)	6	3	4
Taxation	0	0	0
Torts & Personal Injury	4	3	2
Administrative Law	2	7	1
Municipal Law	1	5	8
Constitutional Law (including Civil Rights)	0	2	1
Other	3	0	1

Under a section call Postgraduate Information the question was asked, "What of your law school training is contributing most meaningfully to your present job ability?" There was also a space provided for Comments in the questionnaire. Many respondents took advantage of these opportunities to express themselves concerning

their law school experience both favorably and unfavorably.

In answering the specific question mentioned in the above paragraph some named particular courses such as Constitutional Law, Labor Law, Evidence, Real Property, Contracts, Taxation, Commercial Law, Legal Writing, Torts, Antitrust, International Law, Estate Planning, Trials and Appeals, Procedure courses, and Administrative Law. Others mentioned LAW REVIEW, Casebook method, Case Clubs, and Campbell Competition. Some did not mention specific courses but felt the most value had come from the overall excellent quality of instruction, the professorial insistence on reasoning through problems, the challenge of hard work, the learning of analytical skills and legal deductive reasoning, the training in brief writing and research, the ability to marshall facts and arguments in a persuasive manner as well as the ability to see both sides of an issue. Still others mentioned that the whole experience, the discipline and academic challenge, even the pressure of exams had contributed to their present job ability. Most respondents were very pleased with the training they had received at the University of Michigan Law School stating that its graduates measure well against graduates of other leading law schools.

However, not all respondents were enthusiastic about the law school's contribution to their present situation. A few answered that they did not know of anything which was of benefit. One said that other than vocabulary his three years at law school had contributed nothing. Another said the law school had contributed little other than a degree and philosophical background. Still another said a graduate degree in taxation earned elsewhere had contributed most to his present job ability.

Almost all of the respondents wrote something in the space provided under Comments. Below are some quotations and excerpts which were made.

".... My advice to a young man intending to practice in his hometown and state would be to attend the best state law school in his own state. For those not sure of their intentions or desirous of extending their horizons beyond the hometown Michigan is ideal."

".... I believe more diversified legal writing would have been helpful - the writing of lengthy appellate-type briefs is of minimal value to the average practitioner, whereas experience in digesting facts and presenting shorter pleadings and motions would be of far more benefit."

".... Having it to do over, I believe I should choose a less combative profession, although the law has been good to me."

"While I am not in active practice of law, I have a strong belief that my legal training (as distinguished from legal knowledge) has served me well in a business career."

"I cannot help but feel that the studies you're intending to pursue with the information sought in this questionnaire are of less value than the integrity of one's privacy. Therefore, I must decline to cooperate with you in this."

"Recommend against a graduate choosing initial employment with a corporation unless the corporation can show that they have a staff both competent and interested in training the graduate to apply his legal ability."

".... I have not used my legal training as a practicing attorney would but find my background in law as well as my ability to personally handle certain legal tasks indispensable."

"Sorry, but I'm not going to fill-out the next page. I don't think my income is anybody's business. I will say that my income during the first few years out of law school was a hell of a lot less than starting lawyers seem to think they should have today. There's no substitute for experience; and even the smartest law school graduates aren't worth the starting salaries many of them seem to expect lately, because the law school doesn't really teach them how to practice law."

"There is no doubt in my mind that my choice of the U. of M. Law School was the correct choice. If I had to do it all over again, I would do it exactly the same way."

"I would change the curriculum by dropping the case method in second and third years, teaching all present subjects by brief, outline (survey) courses, and devoting the time saved to legal writing, practical problem solving and broader non-legal courses."

".... It is my view that exposure to all of these categories [question on curricula revision] is desirable and that specialization in law school be minimized. Specialization can be developed after graduation."

".... If the U. of M. continues to decide admissions and give grades on partially an egalitarian basis, I will not send any of my children there. Admission policies and grading of performance should be determined purely on merit. I frankly do not understand by what rational process, the law school established a double standard depending on the race of the applicant and student. The function of the law school should be to train excellent lawyers and not to lower its standards to solve what it sees to be social ills. You now have two standards: merit and color. When will you establish standards for sex, religion, economic states, etc. etc."

"The Michigan Law training was superb."

"The law school failed in two respects from my point of view:

1. Failed to provide good counseling as to what courses would be most useful to me in my career. For example, more stress on taxation should be required.
2. Failed to utilize the case method in a practical way - i.e. by combining it with text matters so that you don't have to read the facts in the case except to understand the issue and to have text material which will summarize more and give one a better feeling for the viewpoint in most states. Harvard's case books seem to do this much more than the U. of M. used to."

"Your entrance requirements, particularly today, are based too much on scholarship ability. There are other qualities that make a good lawyer, which law schools usually fail to measure in granting or denying entrance; i.e., the desire to help one's fellow man, the degree of ethics in one's conscience, the ability to express oneself forensically, aggressiveness, determination, courage, etc.

"You obviously deny entrance to many potentially good future lawyers each year. I suggest you take in a certain percent each year whose entrance is based upon these other considerations, so long as they have at least a law school 'C' grade capability."

"Law School did not prepare me in everyday business aspects of being a lawyer. Education was high caliber but not practical."

"The problems of legal training are practically impossible to deal with in a classroom situation. Learning the lawyer's language is about all you can teach. This, of course, involves teaching some general concepts, but most of a lawyer's training will be on the job. The use of appellate cases is convenient for teachers, but gives a distorted picture of law practice."

"I believe the hopeful trial and appellate advocate is a necessary, and badly neglected, student. As a result very few students are motivated toward trial practice and there is a shortage of same. Trial practice seminars, etc. should be extended and practicing lawyers should be used. I mean real trial lawyers who live their lives in a courtroom. Legal writing and drafting also need attention."

"... there was somehow instilled the idea that if you are a Michigan Law Graduate you are expected to demonstrate the very highest degree of professionalism in handling legal matters. I hope this intangible but critical quality is never lost in the program at the

law School."

"I thought that the idea was that the faculty had practiced law and would therefore thoroughly beef up the theory with the practical aspects. However, this didn't happen often enough."

"I feel that I have learned vastly more about the law since law school than I ever learned at law school. Emphasis on the case method is to my mind a big mistake. It tends to make something immensely complicated that really is quite interesting and not too difficult. If it were my say so I would, for instance, have two texts for real property - the law school case book and the P.L.I. books on contracts and conveyancing of real estate."

"Comparison of U. of M. graduates to other applicants indicates you are still producing superior lawyers."

"I have found from my own experience here in M_____ and from associating with other graduates of Michigan, as well as graduates of other schools, that Michigan offers a better legal education than most other law schools."

".... I have been told that Michigan Law School has been emphasizing social aspects of law. This is for legislators and not lawyers. Such knowledge should be gathered in undergraduate school. I would not recommend Michigan Law School to my son until I learned for myself what the current Michigan Law School curriculum attitude is."

"Encourage the law school faculty and administration to emphasize 'listening' especially to students and public officials - prospective clients of their students. Law School and institutions of higher education generally should be seeking new relationships - partnerships with other institutions, especially in the private sector."

"There is a need for greater 'relevance' in law school education - i.e., practical application of skills to practical problems; how to draw a complaint and answer; how to fill out a tax return; draw a will."

"I wish some way were available for a fine law school such as U. of M. to offer a more intimate relationship with its students"

".... I respectfully offer the following: 1) Give students teachers who teach. Give your people a year's sabbatical every so often just to write. But none of that while they're carrying a full course load; make your people attend a 'how-to-teach' course before turning them loose on students.... 2) I don't know what you're

doing now, but my judgment is that after the first semester, the first two semesters at the latest, the 'case system' is a colossal waste of precious time...."

"It is my feeling that admission standards have become too high. I would prefer some determination of a level at which students can be expected to perform capably in law school and as lawyers, and then select the admittees by lot from that group, rather than simply taking the highest applicants. I graduated in the top 10% of my law school class, and as I now understand the admission standards, I would not be accepted in Michigan Law School. Additionally, I don't want the new lawyers too much smarter than the judges."

"I personally believe that the practice of law in a large urban area is quite alien to that which is learned in law school. This is especially true, I should think, for the sole practitioner such as myself."

"Law school was a depressing, tedious experience. The teachers may be scholars, but are not outstanding in conveying the subject matter. More practical work is essential starting in the first year - client interview, preparation of pleadings and instruments, trial prep and practice. LAW REVIEW is a waste of time."

"I feel that I received a superior legal education which would have qualified me for any law-related occupation. I think more could have been done at the law school with regard to career guidance, specific areas of interest and eventual employment."

"All the time I attended U. of M. Law School I felt out of place. I barely met the minimum requirements at that time. My main reason for attending the U. of M. was because I wanted to return to [A]_____ and become a corporate lawyer for [B]_____ Co. At that time it was practically a requirement of employment in [B]_____ Legal Department to have graduated from Harvard, Yale, or University of Michigan Law Schools. As it worked out I was not hired by [B]_____, but I have become quite successful as a liberal criminal lawyer in a conservative town. I believe the law school did nothing to prepare me for this kind of life, nor do I believe I was ever taught the true meaning of being a lawyer, the responsibility and dedication it requires. I am not so sure any of the professors at the law school at that time knew themselves what being a lawyer is. I must add, however, that I have had a great amount of contact with students from the law school the last three years, and they seem to be learning a great deal more about the practice of law than I ever did...."

"I think that the law school's admission policy is terribly

unfair..."

"Politics and law practice do not mix. Participation in politics hurts more than helps ones law practice. I have also found that grades in school mean very little in practice. It's the ability to attract business, inspire confidence in clients, and the ability to win law suits which are most important, i.e. a fighting spirit plus guts. Our law school is the best. I had to work very hard, but the mental discipline and toughening process paid handsome dividends.... I wish to make some personal observations and recommendations. Let's encourage our law students to start their own practices, that's where the action is, not to be buried in some large law firm. One can be successful anywhere if one starts on one's own. With me - now - the only negative feature of the practice is simply too much pressure, too much work and not enough time to get it out."

"Your compensation schedule [income scale for most recent 4 years] is grossly understated - should go much, much higher."

The law school is most grateful to all those members of the Class of '58 who took the time to fill in and return the questionnaire or write a letter in its place. The law school will appreciate hearing from anyone who can supply the addresses of Harding DeC. Williams and Richard P. Ruby. It is with regret that the school reports that the following members of the Class of '58 are deceased: David C. Berg, Paul Keveney Howe, Byron M. Perry, James Edward Mulligan, and Roger Francis Rader.